

CEPC MINUTES 10-29-98

Attending: Grasso, Kermott (chair), Daniels, Wilson, Emery, Withers (student), Lennox, Reyerson (student)

Guests: Joshua Graber (student)

Call to order: 3:21

1. Minutes for Oct. 15, 1998 meeting APPROVED.

2. New Asian Studies Courses

Dave Emery, chair of the New Course Subcommittee, said that the new Asian Studies courses will be coming to CEPC at the next meeting, and he expects that they will be green sheeted and sent to the full faculty in December.

3. Discussion of the proposal to form a new department from Social Work and Family Resources, to be named the Department of Family Studies and Social Work.

Naurine Lennox reported on the progress being made as George Holt and Family Resources adapt to the staffing changes stemming from the Spring 1998 Staff Plan.

CEPC members commented upon a draft of a new Family Studies major proposal. Since this would be another case of two majors (Family Studies and Social Work) in one department, the registrar wondered about the rule requiring 21 courses outside the major (would a Family Studies major's other Social Work courses be considered "outside" courses?). This led to a general discussion of the "outside 21" problem.

Another member suggested that a 12 course major seemed rather large.

It was noted that the "Family Studies Concentration" portion of the proposal needed to be reworked and come to CEPC separately. A concentration on this campus must be interdisciplinary (at least two departments), and would be part of the IGS Faculty.

3. Wide-ranging discussion on satisfying GE requirements within a major.

One member noted a concern that the work within majors was being compromised and watered down because too much of it had been molded to fit the GE curriculum. A student added that the GE curriculum can be compromised by courses that offer GE credit but that are more appropriately focused on the major.

One problem lies in distinguishing between work in the major and general education. One member claimed that the old catalog language assigning "breadth" to GE and "depth" to majors has become outmoded. Majors are constructed in many different ways, some naturally involving more GE than others. In addition, some disciplines are currently in such a state of disarray (or

creative flux) that members working in the same field often cannot agree about what constitutes excellent work within a major.

Despite such disciplinary upheaval, another member said, in assessment we are supposed to be specifying the goals of our majors and our GE curriculum, and then determining if we are producing the outcomes we claim. Furthermore, if assessment is not just "seeing if we're doing what we say we're doing" but is to be used for the purpose of improving curricular quality, then we must also compare our GE and majors curricula against the best liberal arts colleges in the nation.

CEPC may return to the "GE and the Major" question soon. We also need to get a better sense of how different departments and programs shape their majors, and determine how the descriptive language in the catalog needs to be revised.

Meeting adjourned: 4:28

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Grasso, Secretary